REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-15, which are all of the pending claims, under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,832,268 (Anderson, et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 6,279,008 (Tung Ng, et al.). The Examiner also asked that Applicant update the references to the copending applications listed on page 1 of this application, and the Examiner objected to the Appendices and asked that the contents of the Appendices be incorporated as part of the specification.

Applicant notes that the status of the copending applications listed on page 1 of this application were updated in Applicant's last Amendment. No further updates are needed at this time.

The Examiner's objection to the Appendices is respectfully traversed. In objecting to these Appendices, the Examiner argued that "only 'Computer program listing' can be part of the appendix." It is respectfully submitted that Appendices are not limited to computer code, and that other materials may be submitted in the form of an Appendix. In the present case, a user manual and a description of an algorithm that may be used in the practice of this invention were submitted as Appendices A and B, respectively. These materials may be helpful to a person reading any patent that may issue on the present application. At the same time, these materials do not neatly come within the standard sections of a patent application. It is thus believed to be appropriate, and helpful, to submit these items in the form of Appendices. Consequently, the Examiner is respectfully asked to reconsider and to withdraw the objection to these Appendices.

With respect to the claims, Applicant is herein amending independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 to better define the subject matters of these claims.

For the reasons set forth below, Claims 1-15 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable; and the Examiner is asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-15, and to allow these claims.

G:\Ibm\1110\13682\amend\13682.am2.doc

As discussed in detail in this application, the present invention r lates to object oriented computing environment. The invention, more particularly, provides a procedure for displaying visually certain aspects of objects and complex objects. For example, the invention enables the presentation and manipulation of normalized data, computed fields and summary fields.

Anderson, et al, which is the primary reference relied on by the Examiner to reject the claims, provides a detailed discussion of object oriented programming systems. This reference, though, does not disclose the type of visual support that is enabled by the present invention. The Examiner has recognized this, and thus relies on Tung Ng for the disclosure of a graphical user interface for mapping between objects and databases.

It is respectfully submitted, however, that Tung Ng does not teach all of which it has been cited for. Specifically, Tung Ng does not say anything about support for normalized, computed or summary columns – there is no hint of that anywhere in the patent. The places cited in this patent by the Examiner do not teach what they were cited for. For example, in paragraph thirteen of the Office Action, Tung Ng, Column 9, lines 23-67, is cited for normalized data – but this section merely talks about defining a relationship using a foreign key. It says nothing about using that relationship to manipulate normalized data. Also, the supposed reference to computed columns (in paragraph fourteen of the rejection) points to a place in Tung Ng that says how to define a column as numeric – but this has no bearing at all on defining a computed column. The same place is cited in paragraph fifteen of the rejection for summary columns, again without any bearing in fact.

One, important, specific feature of the present invention that is not disclosed or taught in either Anderson, et al, or Tung Ng, is the quick view feature. This feature, which is discussed on pages 13 and 14 of the application, allows a user to show columns from one table in a view of a second table.

8   G:\lbm\1110\13682\amend\13682.am2.doc

The Tung Ng patent talks about using foreign keys to set up relationships and a visual way to do this. This is not new - there are many products in the market place that do this. However, these tools only let you establish the fact that, for example, Customers are related to Orders by the customer number. They do nothing to facilitate access to the data in the Customer table (e.g., name address, phone number) when looking at the order. This is what the quick view facility is all about. Having established a relationship from customers to orders, the quick view facility lets you, for example, select columns from the customer table to be included as "quick view" columns in the orders table. It has a visual interface to select the columns, and run time function to bring in those columns and process them as if they were part of the orders table.

Independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 clearly describe differences between the claims and the prior art. In particular, Claim 1 describes the feature that the visual support means includes a quick view means for selecting columns from one table to be included as columns in a second, viewed table. Similarly, Claims 6 and 11 describe the step of providing visual support as including providing a quick view support for selecting columns from one table to be included as columns in a second, viewed table.

In light of the above-discussed differences between Independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 and the prior art, and in view of the advantages associated with those differences, it cannot be said that any of these claims is obvious in view of that prior art. Accordingly, these Claims 1, 6 and 11 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2-5, Claims 7-10 and Claims 12-15 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 1, Claim 6 and Claim 11, respectively. The Examiner is, thus, respectfully requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-15, and to allow these claims.

9   G:\Ibm\1110\13682\amend\13682.am2.doc

For the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is asked to reconsider and to withdraw the objection to the Appendices, and to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of, and to allow, Claims 1-15. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

John S. Sensny
John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicant

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:jy

10   G:\Ibm\1110\13682\amend\13682.am2.doc